

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. Howard Robert Harrison 7840 10/614,348 07/08/2003 EXAMINER 7590 03/07/2006 HB INNOVATION LTD. PICKETT, JOHN G #300 PAPER NUMBER ART UNIT 2085 HURONTARIO ST. MISSISSAUGA, ON 3728 CANADA

DATE MAILED: 03/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		$\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{I}}$
Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/614,348	HARRISON, HOWARD ROBERT
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Gregory Pickett	3728
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perions for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the may be earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNI 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI tute, cause the application to become A	CATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>08</u>	July 2003.	
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ The section is FINAL .	his action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allow	·	•
closed in accordance with the practice unde	r <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.[D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims		
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are pending in the applic 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withd 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) 1 and 2 are subject to restriction are	rawn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Exami 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction. 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	ccepted or b) objected to ne drawing(s) be held in abeya ection is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a life.	ents have been received. ents have been received in A riority documents have beer eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No received in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) D Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No	(s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- Claim 1, drawn to an apparatus for vacuum sealing a bag, classified in class 53, subclass 512.
- II. Claim 2, drawn to a vacuum storage bag, classified in class 206, subclass 524.8.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions II and I are related as apparatus and product made. The inventions in this relationship are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the apparatus as claimed is not an obvious apparatus for making the product and the apparatus can be used for making a materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different apparatus (MPEP § 806.05(g)). In this case the product as claimed could be made by a materially different apparatus, such as an apparatus that uses ultrasonic welding as opposed to heat-sealing strips.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

A telephone call was made to Howard Harrison on 27 February 2006 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of

Application/Control Number: 10/614,348 Page 4

Art Unit: 3728

record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory Pickett whose telephone number is 571-272-4560. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 11:30 AM - 8:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mickey Yu can be reached on 571-272-4562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Greg Pickett
Examiner
28 February 2006

Microy VI Supervisory Parent TX MINOR-